

REMARKS:

Claims 13, 20 and 23 were objected to. These claims have been cancelled.

Claims 14-19 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) in view of Kenet et al.

It is believed that the amendments to the independent claims and the arguments forwarded above distinguish applicants' invention from Kenet and therefore overcome this objection as well.

Claim 20 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Kenet et al and further in view of Jackson et al., Richards-Kortum et al or Soller et al.

As discussed above, this claim has been cancelled.

The cancellation of claims 13, 14-20 and 23 is done without prejudice and applicant reserves the right to pursue these or similar claims in one or more divisional applications.

It is noted that all of the rejected or objected claims have been cancelled. It is further noted that the office action states that the remaining claims, 'claims 1, 3-10, 12, 21 and 22 are allowable over the prior art of record'.

Accordingly, it is held that the application is in good order for allowance.

Further and more favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted

Laura M. McIntosh et al.

PER: 

Michael R. Williams

Registration 45,333

June 22, 2007

Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

Telephone (204) 947- - FAX (204) 942-5723